DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 220 456 SP 020 839

TITLE	Teacher Development: Accountability of the Professional Educator. Proceedings of the Annual Conference on Teacher Education (15th, Provo, Utah, March 5, 1982).
INSTITUTION	Association of Teacher Educators, Salt Lake City. Utah Unit.; Utah State Board of Education, Salt Lake City.
PUB DATE	5 Mar 82
NOTE	43p.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Accountability; Competency Based Teacher Education; *Educational Assessment; *Educational Responsibility; Elementary School Teachers; *Schools of Education; Secondary School Teachers; State Standards; Teacher Education; *Teacher Educators; Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Responsibility; *Teaching Skills
IDENTIFIERS	*Utah

ABSTRACT

The proceedings of a conference which focused on accountability in teacher education are supplied in this document. Accountability procedures, such as competency requirements, are examined in a keynote speech by John D. McNeil of the University of California at Los Angeles. Other speakers who offered position papers on accountability were: (1) Vaughn L. Hall, Utah Deputy State Superintendent; (2) Daryl J. McCarty, Executive Secretary of the Utah Education Association; (3) Richard V. Jones, Dean of the School of Education at Weber State College; (4) Gayle Judd, President of of the Utah Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.; and (5) Norman H. Bangerter, Speaker of the House of Representatives. The acceptance speech by Oral L. Ballam, designated Utah Teacher of the Year for 1982, is included. A list of conference participants is appended. (FG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED220456

SP

A REPORT ON THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE 15TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT: ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR

Sponsored by:

The Utah State Board of Education

Walter D. Talbot, Superintendent

In cooperation with:

The Utah Association of Teacher Educators

Conference Center
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

March 5, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

V. L. Hall

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SP 020 839

UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
UTAH STATE BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
250 East 500 South
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111

BOARD MEMBERS

Lila B. Bjorklund, Chairman
District 1
Salt Lake City 84103

Jesse Anderson, Vice Chairman
District 4
Ogden 84401

W. Dean Belnap
District 5
Kaysville 84037

Neola Brown
District 7
Cedar City 84720

Joan Burnside
District 2
Magna 84044

A. Glenn Christensen
District 2
Salt Lake City 84107

Erma J. Christensen
District 1
Salt Lake City 84105

Rodney L. Dahl
District 3
Sandy 84070

Ross B. Denham
District 7
Provo 84601

Jay A. Monson
District 4
Logan 84321

Karl Shisler
District 6
Roosevelt 84066

Walter D. Talbot, Executive Officer

LaPreal W. Lublin, Secretary

TEACHER DEVELOPMENT:
ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR

Fifteenth Annual
Conference on Teacher Education

Sponsored by

THE UTAH STATE OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Walter D. Talbot
State Superintendent of Public Instruction

In cooperation with

UTAH ASSOCIATION OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

Conference Center
Brigham Young University
Provo, Utah

March 5, 1982

7/82/250

UTAH ASSOCIATION OF TEACHER EDUCATORS

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Max Berryessa	President
Marlin A. Fairbourn	President-Elect
Don Lennberg	Past President
Kathy Luke	Secretary Treasurer
Vere McHenry	Executive Secretary
Ione Garcia	Membership Chairman
Eldon Puckett	Program Chairman
Briant Farnsworth	Nominations

PROGRAM COMMITTEE

Eldon Puckett, Chairman
Vere McHenry
LaMar Allred
Florence Krall
Roger Mouritsen

FOREWORD

Three years ago the Spring Conference on Teacher Education focused on "Designing Teacher Education for the Future." Following that conference, the Utah Association of Teacher Educators (UATE) sponsored a series of six satellite conference for the purpose of formulating recommendations for the restructuring of teacher education in Utah to be submitted to the State Advisory Committee on Teacher Education. At the conclusion of these conferences, the Executive Committee of UATE synthesized the responses gathered and formulated the following action goals:

1. Identify and study roles and relationships and various collaborative arrangements in teacher education as they affect cooperating teachers, administrators, district personnel, clients, learners, universities, and the state office of education.

2. Formation of a network of learning resources that would provide information and support services for teacher education to school districts and teachers throughout the state.

3. Foster multiple means for the education of teachers and the accountability of teacher educating agencies for the effective performance of teachers.

4. Investigate models of teacher education that blend preservice and inservice as an ongoing growth continuum.

The 1980 Spring Conference focused on the first of these goals: Roles and Relationships in Teacher Education. A year later the conference dealt with preservice/inservice models (Goal #4), and this year the theme was professional accountability (Goal #3). Because of widespread current interest in this topic, it has been decided that its consideration will be continued throughout 1982-83 and the focus will again be on accountability in the 1983 Spring Conference.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Foreword	iv
Program	1
Accountability of the Professional Educator. John D. McNeil	3
Professional Accountability and the Proposed Utah System for Professional Development. Vaughn L. Hall	9
Presentation to the ANNUAL Spring Conference on Teacher Education. Daryl J. McCarty	17
Accountability of the Teacher Educator. Richard V. Jones	21
Accountability. Gayle Judd	27
Accountability. Norman H. Bangerter	31
Small Group Discussion	35
Acceptance of Award. Oral L. Ballam	37
Utah Teacher Educator of the Year	41
Annual Spring Conference Participants	43

PROGRAM

8:30	Registration/Continental Breakfast	Outside Room 258
9:00	General Session	Room 258
	Greetings, Introductions, Announcements Max Berryessa, President, UATE	
	Keynote Speaker: Dr. John D. McNeil University of California at Los Angeles	
10:00	Break	
10:15	Position Statements on Accountability	
	Utah State Office of Education:	Vaughn L. HaLL, Deputy State Superintendent
	Utah Education Association:	Daryl McCarty Executive Secretary
	Teacher Preparing Institutions:	Richard V. Jones Dean of Education Weber State College
	Utah Congress of Parents & Teachers:	Gayle Judd, President
	State Legislature:	Norman Bangerter, Speaker House of Representatives
11:15	Small Group Discussions and Formulation of Questions	
11:45	Response to Questions	Panel
12:15	Break	
12:30	Luncheon	Room 260
	Entertainment - Mountain View High School Chamber Choir Director: Lloyd Anderton	
	Awards	
	Introduction of New Officers	
	Conference Summary	
2:30	Adjourn	

ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE PROFESSIONAL EDUCATOR

John D. McNeil
University of California at Los Angeles

Old Style Accountability

In 1978, three researchers documented the enduring effects of a remarkable first grade teacher, Miss A.[1] Increased IQ changes, pupil effort, initiative, and school achievement over an entire school career were clearly related to contact with Miss A. More dramatic, evidence over a twenty-five year time span linked the instructional influence of this teacher to later adult achievement of her pupils. Interviewers found differences between the adult status of individuals who had been assigned to Miss A. and those who had been assigned as first graders to Miss B., Miss C., and other teachers. Former pupils of Miss A. had much higher status as indicated by occupation, education, personal appearance, and other factors. Two-thirds of Miss A.'s pupils achieved the highest status compared to less than half that proportion for the former pupils of the other teachers. None of Miss A.'s pupils were in the lowest category, but more than a third of the other respondents had this unhappy experience.

What accounted for these dramatic findings? Careful elimination of possible explanations led to the conclusion that it was Miss A. herself who was the key influence. How did she do it? "It did not matter what background or abilities the beginning pupil had, there was no way that pupil was not going to read by the end of grade one." She gave extra hours to the children who were slow learners. When children forgot their lunches, she would give them some of her own; and she stayed after school to help children. She adjusted to new methods; but, in addition, she showed a lot of confidence in children.

I believe that Miss A. illustrated old style accountability. She was accountable for her actions taken in the course of carrying out her duties as a teacher. She knew how she was teaching and whether or not it was right for all. She showed broader consideration for pupils than an external group might prescribe. She knew what she was doing and why.

New Style Accountability

Accountability new style rests on distinctions between ends and means, values and facts. Accordingly, there are pre-specified outcomes or competencies (ends) and accompanying measures. Whatever instructional strategies are used to effect these ends are valid only if the desired results are attained. At an extreme, the new accountability is a form of technical control whereby those external to the classroom--legislature, board, colleagues--hold the teacher or program accountable for results as indicated by measures of pre-specified objectives.

---

[1] E. Pederson, T. Faucher, and W. Eaton, "A New Perspective on the Effects of First Grade Teachers on Children's Subsequent Adult State." Harvard Education Review, 48, 1. Feb. 1978, pps. 1-31.

An example of new style accountability is found in the state of Georgia where an innovative approach to teacher certification is being implemented.[2] Instead of the state delegating the responsibility to certificate to colleges and universities that offer approved programs for teachers, Georgia has returned direct responsibility to the state for determining who should receive a certificate. The procedure is as as follows: First a candidate completes a preparation program in a college or university. Then the candidate must take and pass a test in order to receive an initial certificate. This test is a measure of the canadidate's subject-matter knowledge in the area for which one is seeking certification. Upon passing the test, the candidate has three years to demonstrate in the classroom certain performance competencies. Data collectors complete on-site assessment. The assessment depends on the judgment of trained raters.

I should mention that the validation of the competency measures is a problem. A recent study suggests the possibility that certification programs may reject as many competent teachers as incompetent ones.[3] In this study, a list of performance competencies was developed and a set of appropriate instruments was constructed to record behavior relevant to the competencies. The competencies reflected the literature on teacher effectiveness and the consensus of experienced teachers. Among the 25 competencies selected were those related to communicating (gives clear, explicit directions); assisting (respects the individual's right to speak and uses nonverbal communication skills); method (uses more than one teaching method in a single presentation); and managing (when a student is not on task, teacher makes contact). A range in student growth measures--academic achievement in many subject areas, student affect, and self-concept indicators--were used to show the relation between competency displayed and student progress.

Full-time observers visited the classrooms of 60 teachers over a two-year period. The results indicated that many of the desired teaching competencies slightly increased academic achievement but decreased the student's positive view of self. Some competencies were associated with desirable achievement at one grade level but with undesirable progress at another level. One relationship was positive for the teaching of mathematics but negative for language.

Parenthetically, the search for the effective teacher has never been very successful. A.S. Barr devoted forty years in such a search. In looking back over his investigations, Barr asked, "What progress has been made?" His answer was that some progress had been made in clarifying the problem. The problem that needs clarifying before all others is the criterion of teaching effectiveness. Other problems are the difficulties of (a) isolating teacher influence from the influence of home, peers, and environ-

---

[2] T. Drummand and T. Andrews, "The Influence of Federal and State Governments on Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 2, Oct. 1980, pps. 97-100.

[3] H. Coker, et.al., "How Valid are Expert Opinions About Effective Teaching?", Phi Delta Kappan, 62, 2, Oct. 1980, pps. 131-149.

ment; and (b) relating the specific teaching acts to larger ends. It appears that the constituents of effectiveness are not just found in the teacher, pupil, or school but in the relationships that exist among the three at any given time and place.

The Plusses of New Style Accountability

The focus on particular measurable competencies and outcomes has reduced course fragmentation. It has made teaching more efficient, and it has helped modify programs in teacher preparation by directing attention to the requirements of classroom instruction. Consideration of what the teacher is expected to do on the job is necessary when planning a competency-based program. Materials used in the Weber College Competency Program, for instance, have been well received by many institutions interested in helping future teachers acquire confidence in dealing with many of the common tasks associated with teaching.

I think that specifying objectives makes it more likely that faculties and others give thought to the desirability of the goals selected. For me, the justification of goals (if it occurs) is the most important byproduct of the new style accountability.

Negative Features

Narrow goals, a tendency for objectives to become fixed, accountability to the interests of external agencies rather than being responsible to the wider needs of one's students are among the criticisms of accountability new style. By way of example, several years ago I prepared a program for the preparation of reading specialists. I followed the state guidelines for desired competencies in order to gain state approval. Subsequently, when carrying out the program, there were limitations in what had been proposed. Newer knowledge of the reading process suggested more important content and teaching strategies. Also, students introduced problem areas that were unnoticed at the time of the original planning. Hence, adaptations were made. Later, however, the state applied an evaluative tool--the discrepancy model--by which site visitors criticized the program because it departed from the original plan. In brief, accountability to pre-specified goals was more important than responding to newer knowledge and the needs of students.

Why is the New Accountability so Popular?

The term "Crisis in Legitimacy" comes to mind. The media speak of the declining quality of teachers. Surveys report that scores on the National Teachers Examination have declined during the last seven years. Education is said to be getting fewer of the brightest young women than when women were less acceptable in prestigious fields. A large percentage of those who are in the top, as opposed to those at the bottom of their class in education, leave teaching after one year.

The gap between administrators and teachers appears to widen. Although a recent poll shows high satisfaction with teaching (97% say they like teaching and 82% would go into it again), the same poll reports that most teachers want to exercise more control over professional matters having

more say in school policy matters.[4] Further, teachers feel less worthy and less productive than those of ten years ago. Only 53 percent say that the college or university sufficiently prepared them for teaching.

Teacher collective bargaining and increased political activity might have weakened public regard for teachers. Contracts that reduce the availability of teachers for conferencing, planning, and community service take a toll in public opinion. Efforts by teachers to bargain and pressure legislatures tend to have teachers viewed as a special interest group rather than valued for educational expertise.

Most importantly, the public wants assurance that schools are going in the right direction, that important values and learning, such as the basic skills, are being given the emphasis desired. Accountability is seen as a way to give this assurance.

Will Accountability Restore Legitimacy?

In the short run, accountability procedures, such as the application of competency exams and improved test results will be helpful. The American public is reassured about situations involving a loss of confidence in institutions or office when officials take action. The appointment of special commissions and the passing of corrective legislation are cases in point.

We know, however, that single solutions, such as competency-based teacher education, are too simple a solution. The improvement of teaching and teaching preparation require commitment and resources from many. We will need a mix of both old and new style accountability. Partnerships of those in academic fields and professional educators, cooperation of school and community will be required in setting purposes and deciding upon responsibilities for making the schools better places in which to live and work.

The mandating of rules and desired outcomes will not suffice. We want more than compliance in the sense of fulfilling the letter of the regulations--we want the teacher's dedicated spirit. Today in some schools, there is a Plan A that serves as the official rendering of the school and its way of working, and there is Plan B, the actual program of the school as conducted behind closed doors. No external agency can specify in advance all that a teacher should do. Instead, there must be encouragement for teachers to exercise judgment, responsibility, reason, and commitment. There should be opportunities for teachers to justify their decisions.

An Alternative to Technical Control

Both schools and the larger society suffer from special interests and loss in communication. The use of adversarial methods, bargaining, manipulation, and the unnecessary domination of special interests is a matter of concern. Reliance on the law as the only arbitrator of truth weakens education.

---

[4]"Second National Teacher Poll, Instructor, 41, Sept. 1981, pps. 18-20.

Jürgen Habermas, the German philosopher who has stirred the interest of the intellectual community in Western countries for three decades, has expounded a theory of communications that offers a way educational communities (colleges, schools, classrooms) can restore rationality to the enterprise.[5] As seen in the attached outline, there are four essentials to communication.

1. One must be comprehensible. The listener must understand what is being said. If not, the speaker must give examples, clarify, explicate, or translate.

2. A speaker must have some knowledge or truth to share. In education, we sometimes do not openly confront a speaker and say that we doubt the truth of the statements made. Communication theory says that we should. Then the speaker can attempt to justify the truth of the statements by referring to relevant experience and appealing to particular authorities. If necessary, participants in the communication process should subject themselves to evidence and force of argument in order to arrive at a common agreement regarding the facts of the matter.

3. The speaker must be perceived as truthful. The speaker's intention must not be deceptive. If listeners do not perceive truthfulness, speakers must be given opportunity to assure or to demonstrate by subsequent actions their willingness to follow through on the implication of what they are saying.

4. Rightness is the fourth essential. It is the claim that what is said, suggested, or recommended is appropriate for the context. Recommendations are right when they are perceived as appropriate in the light of the norms and values of the listeners. At times, it is necessary to appeal to common norms and to show the relation between the proposal and the norms.

   It may also be necessary to have a critical discussion centering on the validity of the group's norms. That is, the existing view of what is proper may be questioned in light of whether it (the norm) contributes to the satisfying of human needs for all. During the conduct of such a discussion, the group should ask themselves whether they know what they want. Further, they should be guided by (a) a single motive--to arrive at what is obviously the best solution, and (b) a single constraint--the weight of evidence and reason.

---

[5] Chapter 4, "Foundations: A Theory of Communication," in the Critical Theory of Jurgen Habermas, Thomas McCarthy, editor. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1981.

ALTERNATIVE TO TECHNICAL CONTROL

1.	comprehensive	explicate translate
2.	truth - knowledge to share	relevant experiences appeal to authority discourse: subject self to evidence; force of arguments
3.	truthful	assure assume responsibility
4.	rightness regulations meet norms	appeal to norm critical discussion: single motive single constraint Does norm satisfy need? Do we know what we want?

PROFESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY AND THE PROPOSED UTAH SYSTEM FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Vaughn L. Hall
Deputy State Superintendent

Introduction--Background Statements on Teacher Education

1. Greatest challenge facing education in the next decade is to maintain (or improve) the quality of education while meeting the projected growth of up to 50 percent by 1990.

2. By all odds, the teacher is the most important factor in the determination of quality of education.

3. Some overriding questions:

   a. Can we recruit and train an adequate number/quality of student-teachers for replacement and growth needs?

   b. What changes and innovations are required in teacher education programs to meet these growth and quality challenges?

   c. Where are the resources, how can they be harnessed and allocated to solve the problem.

4. Additional observations:

   a. By 1993-97 higher education will experience the same relative growth that we see now beginning in elementary-secondary schools.

   b. Where will higher education get additional staff to meet this growth? (In all probability much of the staff will be drawn from the ranks of K-12.)

   c. Teacher supply-demand picture on a national basis may affect the problem in Utah. For example, in-migration--out-migration may affect the supply-demand and in addition may present problems of reciprocity, focus on in-service, etc.

   d. Innovations to enhance productivity such as double session, year round schools, reorganization of instruction may impact substantially on teacher education in the decade ahead.

* * * * * * *

Quality control in teacher education has been a long-time goal of the Utah State Board of Education. The Board has established a system of evaluation of teacher education programs based on "program approval." This means that all of the programs in an institution which lead to certification must be officially approved by the State Office of Education. At least once in each five year period, a formal on-site visit to the campus of each Utah teacher education institution is conducted. A team organized under the direction of the Utah State Office of Education and representatives of other preparing institutions, school practitioners, and Utah State Office

of Education staff evaluate each program offered. The evaluation includes an in-depth look at general education and professional education requirements as well as each subject matter major and minor offered for teacher certification.

Utah has been in the forefront of the competency-based teacher education movement since the late 1960's. Competency-based teacher education refers to a program that identifies the knowledge and skills a successful teacher should possess and the demonstration through performance that a prospective teacher has gained the knowledge and skills specified. Competence, therefore, refers to the individual's ability to demonstrate possession of knowledge, skills, and personal characteristics needed to satisfy the special demands or requirements of teaching.

Significant progress has been made in shifting teacher preparation and certification programs away from the mere accumulation of college credits and degrees, which seems to have had only limited correlation with teaching success, to measurable/observable skills and competencies. This competency-based movement has largely been a response to the demand by society for more accountability for teacher effectiveness. While many states have increased requirements for initial certification and then required periodic recertification to satisfy this demand, other states are now considering a formal and periodic performance assessment program as a way to provide a more focused and better accountability system.

Perhaps no state has undertaken a program as broad in scope and comprehensive in nature as has Georgia. Several other states have patterned their efforts after them. Some Utah educators, legislators, and lay citizens have expressed considerable interest in what Georgia is doing. On at least two occasions within the past year, consultants involved in the Georgia program have been invited to Utah to make presentations about their performanced-based certification program.

While there is much to learn from what Georgia has done, parallel developments have been taking place there in our own state. These developments have not been as systematically correlated in Utah as they have been in Georgia, but the component part can be brought together into a workable system that has great potential for the improvement of teaching in Utah. A major effort in this regard would be to upgrade an already effective teacher education system to assure the public demonstration of competence that accountability suggests.

An excellent system could be developed in Utah, capitalizing on existing systems and programs that would:

1. Involve all Utah teachers into a professional development program in a relatively short time, three to five years, and beginning teachers within one to three years.

2. Capitalize on the findings of experience and research in organizing the system.

3. Capitalize on the Utah Teaching Skills Model--a statewide program sponsored by the Utah State Office of Education which has developed 14 skill areas needed by teachers with learning guides to achieve them.

4. Capitalize on needed personality traits of teachers as identified through the Utah Teaching Skills Model.

5. Build on the peer review system used in Utah for several years by the Utah Professional Practices Advisory Commission.

6. Utilize better the concept of the Utah Professional Certification Program.

Following is an expansion of this system accompanying some programs already existing in Utah and a comparison of these with the Georgia system.

I. DEVELOPMENTAL AND ASSESSMENT AREAS

A. Subject Matter Mastery.

For many years the majority of both preservice and inservice teacher education programs have centered upon a wide range and an in-depth study of subject matter. Many people, particularly those trained in academic disciplines, have argued that the acquisition of subject matter either is the only or at least the basic qualification for teachers in the public schools. This view of teacher education has been and is presently reflected in state regulations which require those seeking teaching certification to submit evidence, usually college or university transcripts, that they have completed a specified number of credit hours of study in major and minor subject disciplines such as history, mathematics, science, literature, etc.

However, in a landmark study published jointly in 1961 by the American Association of School Administrators, the National School Board Association, and the NEA Department of Classroom teachers, Nicholas A Fattu and Associates at Indiana University analyzed more than 150 studies and research summaries on teacher effectiveness. One of the major conclusions of the extensive review of research was related to professional knowledge and skills. It concluded that while it has often been said that mastery of a subject is all that is needed for teaching success, "research findings simply do not support this assumption. Rather, whether or not knowledge of subject matter is related to instructor competence seems to be a function of the particular teaching situation. ...within the range of knowledge represented by those who have been selected as teachers, knowledge of subject matter does not appear to be a major factor in teaching performance. (AASA, NEA, and NSBA, Who Is a Good Teacher? AASA, 1961, p. 23)

While it is not a knowledge of subject matter alone that contributes to teaching effectiveness, good grades in college and effective teaching appear to be consistently related.

In its Performance-Based Program, Georgia has developed a series of criterion-referenced tests designed to assess an individual's teaching field content knowledge. By way of contrast in the Utah System for Professional Development, it is proposed that a series of criterion-referenced tests be developed to measure content knowledge and applicability of selected subject matter at grade levels appropriate to the teacher's assignment as identified in the state courses of study. Each state curriculum specialist, with appropriate resource help, would formulate questions to assess the teacher's knowledge in subjects assigned at appropriate grade levels. The pool of questions thus generated would be incorporated into a microcomputer program and an appropriate number drawn to at random to test teachers throughout the state on an individualized time schedule. Assessment items would be validated for inclusion into the system.

B. Teaching Skills

A professional teachers has been trained to identify the specific learner needs and to help the student satisfy these needs through a variety of teaching strategies. Professional teachers apply and utilize their teaching skills in ways that become increasingly effective and creative, learners' needs are satisfied, and the teaching/learning processes are rewarding for both the learner and the teacher.

Fattu (Op. Cit. pp. 23-24) concluded that there is some evidence that teachers who have more professional knowledge (as measure by the National Teacher Examination, for example) tend to be more effective teachers, though the evidence is not so strong as might be expected. There is evidence that teachers who have had professional preparation are more effective than those who have not. In terms of ability to solve problems that professional teachers meet, Turner and Fattu (1960) found significant differences between those who had completed a methods course and those who had not; those who had an education degree and those who had only a liberal arts degree; those who had one year of teaching experience and those who had none; those who had three or more years of experience and those who had only one. Differences were in favor of those with the greater professional knowledge. Results here are more clear-cut because more attention was devoted to the canons of scientific investigation than was true in other related studies. In other words, when contaminating and obscuring factors were removed, the relationship of professional knowledge to performance was sharp and undeniable.

The Georgia program provides for a performance assessment in 14 competency areas (16 areas were identified, but two were dropped because their validity could not be established).

The Utah System for Professional Development also proposes the recognition of 14 skills areas. These skill areas are similar to Georgia's but not mutually inclusive. The Utah skill areas are based on the Utah Teaching Skills Model, a developmental project

funded by the USOE over the past three years and involving all six Utah teacher training institutions.

The teaching skills in the Utah Model are based on learner needs. They are currently in the process of being validated in terms of (a) teacher change, (b) pupil change. Further piloting is needed in a school district setting to generate empirical data for qualitative evaluation. It is imperative that the Skills Model be integrated into a system that can capitalize on resources found and which can be delivered to a local, especially rural, school district.

C. Personality

The personality dimension of the Utah Professional Development System refers to the dynamic, integrated pattern of motivational and temperamental or emotional qualities that distinguishes the individual as a successful teacher. Frequently teacher education programs have been offered to assist the teacher in developing personal characteristics and human relations techniques which are accepting and supporting of the learner as a person. The developers of these programs have identified such concepts as self, empathy, nondirective counseling, or interaction analysis as cornerstones of their programs.

These contributions to teacher education programs by those advocating the "art of teaching" have been instrumental in helping to foster ideas and practices of good human relations in the teaching/learning processes. On the basis of the research completed to date, it appears advantageous to classify each trait in a continuum and, whenever possible, to use ERIC descriptors to describe the traits. This should standardize meanings and facilitate further research on the various traits cited.

Accordingly, ten personality traits have been identified for possible incorporation into the Utah system for Professional Development.:

(1) Intelligence
(2) Maturity (individuals)
(3) Interpersonal Attraction
(4) Empathy
(5) Goal Orientation
(6) Imagination
(7) Positive (Attitudes)
(8) Emotional Adjustment
(9) Communication Skills
(10) Enthusiasm

Instruments for measuring this competency dimension need to be developed or adapted and validation accomplished in each of the ten traits similar to the teaching area.

II. PROCEDURE

The Georgia Teacher Performance Assessment Program focuses on two of the three dimensions of teacher competency--subject matter and teaching skills. Since May 1, 1980, all applicants for initial certification in Georgia have been required to pass a criterion-reference test in their teaching field. The test is administered quarterly at four sites. If the candidate successfully passes the CRT, he/she is issued a non-renewable one-year certificate. To qualify for a renewable credential, the applicant must demonstrate satisfactory on-the-job performance within a maximum of three years of employment in Georgia schools. (This provisional certificate may be reissued if the teacher is recycled, but is non-renewable after three years.)

Teaching skills are assessed by a team of three professional educators. The team is composed of an administrator and a peer teacher from the local education agency and an external data collector employed at a regional assessment center. Each evaluator has been trained to use the assessment instruments involved in the system. There are currently 17 regional assessment centers in Georgia employing approximately 80 full-time data collectors. Over 2.5 million dollars was appropriated in 1980 to coordinate the on-the-job assessment of all beginning teachers.

The Utah System would propose to use a modified form of "peer review" to conduct the actual evaluation of teacher competency, utilizing measuring instruments adapted from other sources, such as Georgia's TPAI, or developed specifically for use in our schools. The peer review process has been used for several years by the Utah Professional Practices Advisory Commission (UPPAC) to help remediate teachers whose performance in the classroom has been judged to be substandard. It is believed that peer reviewers can also be used for purposes of general evaluation and improvement of instruction. Training workshops would be organized to acquaint potential reviewers in each school district with the latest techniques in performance evaluation and report writing.

Further, the immediate administrator/supervisor of the teacher being reviewed would be used to expand on the evaluation of the peer reviewer. External evaluators, comparable to Georgia's Data collectors, would not be utilized.

Only the most competent teachers, about five percent of the teaching staff of each school district, would be trained as peer evaluators. The training would be patterned after the workshops conducted by the UPPAC. This would provide a pool of about one peer evaluator for each 20 teachers in each school district. Small school districts could exchange reviewers on a regional basis to insure coverage of all speciality areas.

III. CERTIFICATION

Georgia ties permanent, renewable certification directly to its performance assessment program. It is proposed that the Utah System for Professional Development establish a similar tie to certification. For several years Utah has had a two-level certification system with a Basic Professional Certificate awarded upon completion of a traditional four-year teacher preparation program and a Professional Certificate award upon completion of a planned, comprehensive fifth year of study, preferably including the master's degree, plus three years of successful teaching.

Since the system is based on a three-dimensional competency assessment, and the implication is that a considerable amount of additional study will be required to bring the candidate "up to speed" in all competency areas, the Professional Certificate would be awarded only on the basis of the individual being judged "competent" in all three dimensions of the Professional Development System.

With the awarding of the Professional Certificate, appropriate recognition on the salary schedule would be in order. The Georgia program provides a $1,000 increment when permanent certification is achieved. It is proposed that the Utah System provide a significant increment (perhaps equal to one weighted pupil unit) for the professional certificate.

SUMMARY

Teaching competencies as defined in the Utah System for Professional Development are comprised of three necessary and mutually complementary factors or dimensions. Each of these three has empirical research to provide a foundation for using these factors with confidence in the preparation and upgrading of professional teachers.

The evaluation procedure is based on a modified form of peer review. Training of reviewers will be provided under the leadership of the Utah State Office of Education in cooperation with the Utah Professional Practices Advisory Commission.

Those individuals judged to be competent in all three dimensions of professional development will be awarded the Professional Certificate with an appropriate salary increase.

This proposal has been received by the State Board of Education but has not been adopted. Further study is needed of this and other plans for bringing about increased professional accountability. The public needs to be continually reassured that quality teachers, administrators, and other support personnel are delivering quality education to the children and youth of this state and this nation. It is the aim of the Utah State Office of Education and the State Board of Education to provide a system to give that assurance.

PRESENTATION TO THE ANNUAL SPRING CONFERENCE ON TEACHER EDUCATION

Daryl J. McCarty
Executive Secretary, Utah Education Association

I am always somewhat concerned when asked to talk about accountability. Not because I don't have some strong feelings about it--because I do. And, not because I don't have my own definition of it--because I also have that. The concern I have is that we all hear what is said from our own feelings and definitions, not from those of the presenter. Now, with that understanding of possible misunderstandings, let me give you some of my thoughts, mingled with a little "scripture"--that is, official policy statements of the Utah Education Association.

I know of no other profession that has such a difficult task of trying to determine who is accountable for what, as is found in the field of education. Most, if not all, other professions leave the major decisions of organizing for and practicing the profession up to the professional. Medical doctors alone diagnose the problem and prescribe for their patients. They do it, normally, on a one-to-one basis. The vast majority of the time they receive little or no argument--or advice--from the patient, even though the patient may have been through the same illness or operation before.

People seeking out the help from attorneys normally do not give advice to the attorney, even though the client may have been through a similar experience many times. Again, the practice is normally carried out on a one-to-one basis.

When taking a prescription to a pharmacist, I don't ever recall hearing a customer advise the pharmacist as to how to carry out his practice. (Part of the blame may be that most of us can't read Latin, nor the doctor's handwriting.) Most of us have had tens, if not hundreds, of prescriptions filled. Again, the practice is carried out on a one-to-one basis.

Engineers designing a bridge or some other structure use their expertise, seeking advice from whom they want, when they want. They, too, use their expertise and normally don't have the unskilled or untrained in their field telling them what to do. The ultimate of what they do is on a one-to-one basis, or, at worst, with those others of their own choosing.

It is true that the professionals mentioned here rely upon being successful by satisfying their patients, clients, or customers, who have the freedom of choice to go elsewhere. However, how successful they are is ultimately decided by them, their sound judgment and ability, not by poor organization, impossible tasks, and working outside their field of expertise, as decided by their clients, parents of their clients, elected boards, and the legislature. Almost all laws passed by the legislature, which in any way govern them, are first drafted by these professionals. Practically all oversight of their work is done by their colleagues.

Now, turning to the matter of accountability in education, we leave the seclusion of the private sector and jump into the "mumbo-jumbo" realm of

the public sector. Here, particularly in education, everybody has been or is going through it. Everyone gives advice--freely. All know how to best do it. Federal and state laws, through elected officials, outline the problem and prescribe the cure. Someone other than the professionals have decided the turf--the who, what, why, where, how, and when of education. This ranges from what a school district's boundary shall be to the looks of a school building; from what the amount of funding shall be to how to best spend it. Yes, I admit that in some of these steps some professionals are involved, but no place along the way is the judgment of the person expected to carry out the ultimate function of education--the classroom teacher--the final decision maker. Legislature, school board members, parents, and students all seem to have more influence on the organization, assignment, and approach to education than does the classroom teacher.

Here is a group of students, to be taught particular subjects from pre-selected (or pre-eliminated) textbooks, in a particular school year, during a particular period of time, and with this number of students in your class. Here, also, are other duties for the professional--hall duty, playground duty, lunch duty, bus duty, parking lot duty, chaperoning for plays, ticket-taking at athletic events, bouncers at many activities, and breaking up fights on the playground and in the hallways. (I ask you, how many doctors, attorneys, pharmacists, engineers, etc., do you know who would put with that?)

Then, how about the assignments to teach in a field in which you have never been trained and in which you have little or not interest.

True, parents and students have little or no say in the school they attend (except through the original decision of where they live) or those who will teach them. On the other hand, how many doctors, attorneys, pharmacists, and engineers do you know who are compelled to accept anyone who comes to their doors; or if they will not follow what is prescribed for them? If you do not take the medicine prescribed by the doctor and compounded by the pharmacist for you, can you honestly hold either of them accountable for your continuing ailments? A teacher must also contend with all that happens in a student's day--before coming to school, the class before they get them, the class after, and the rest of the day after school closes. The entire life of a student, good and bad, must be dealt with.

Enough of this scenario. Now, let me turn to "scripture." In 1974 the UEA House of Delegates adopted a position statement relative to accountability. The opening paragraph states: "Educational achievement of students is demonstrated in many ways and is a product of the interaction of students, teachers, administrators, school boards, parents, and others in the community. While each party to the educational process has area(s) of special responsibility, all are jointly accountable for the outcome; and the accountability of any one party is contingent upon the optimum performance, under optimum circumstances, of all parties."

The statement further states: "It is desirable that evaluation of the educational process and system be conducted continuously and responsibly. The following principles and concepts should serve as guidelines:

1. Those participating in education should continually improve skills and competencies.

2. A climate which is conducive to high professional performance of educators and to learning should be maintained.

3. Curriculum policies and procedures should be developed cooperatively by teachers, board, administration, students, parents, and the community.

4. Policies should provide for the efficient operation of the school and should facilitate sound educational practices.

5. Resources necessary for educational achievement should be allocated, including:

   a. Assignment to teach only in positions for which the teachers is prepared.

   b. Class sizes which allow for individual attention.

   c. Adequate and appropriate supportive personnel, facilities, space resources, and teaching materials.

   d. Freedom to teach and learn without fear of reprisals.

   e. Evaluation procedures should be determined cooperatively by all groups concerned.

   f. Provisions of specialized professional services for diagnosis and assistance (health, welfare, guidance, and psychological) of students.

   g. Disciplinary policies and procedures which assure an atmosphere in which learning can occur."

"Accountability programs developed in school districts or by the state should meet the guidelines. In addition, any such programs should be carefully field tested before implementation. Implementation and development require adequate time and funding."

Let me ask those of you attending this conference today, do you really feel any of these are unreasonable requests, from professionals involved, in addressing the question of accountability? If you were to re-word these to fit the professions of medicine, law, pharmacy, engineering, or any other profession, do you really believe there would be much debate or argument relative to this being a fair, responsible, and professional approach to their accountability? I think not.

One or two failures by these other professionals mentioned do not a lack of accountability make. Yet, one student who doesn't achieve the degree of success a parent, or a businessman, or a university president desires, seems to bring the wrath of the community upon the schools and a cry for <u>accountability</u> of the classroom teachers.

The Utah Education Association and Daryl McCarty do not argue with efforts to improve--constantly improve--what we are doing in education. Education in America and in Utah has succeeded beyond the greatest hopes and dreams of 50 or 100 years ago. Yet, we cannot rest on the laurels of the past. We must look for better ways, more successes.

However, I do resist the efforts which say one test of measurement can bring about accountability if that test fails to recognize that the education of a child's mind and being is many faceted with many parts of his or her life coming into play. The same holds true if that test refuses to look at the whole picture of education--from the Congress of the United States to the school district, to the classroom; or if that test asks an underfunded, overworked system, with expectations of curing all of society's weakness and ills, to be more accountable.

I do support honest efforts at improving education--those which recognize that the classroom teachers is not the master of his or her fate; which understands that the role of education is not as clearly defined in our society as is the role of the doctor, lawyer, pharmacist, or engineer; which admits that any accountability in education must be made to include not only teachers but students, parents, administrators, school board members, and legislators.

In conclusion, I'd like to state that I do not believe the professional teacher can truly be expected to make the strides necessary and be held to the accountability desired until they are allowed to buy into the system of education. They must become so involved with input into the system and such an integral part of the decision making and planning process that they know this is indeed <u>their</u> profession.

If nothing else, this feeling of being a part--a very vital and essential part--of the profession is what has made the other professions as great as they are. Not that their worth is any greater to society, as opposed to the public sector. Rather, that they have been given the right to study, practice, and be a professional. They are given the right to make mistakes and rebound as professionals. The destiny of their profession is in their own hands.

Oh, that this right, respect, and opportunity could be given to this, the greatest of all professions, this profession called education.

Accountability can only truly be achieved when all who are involved are given the right to "buy into the system" at their appropriate level of responsibility and when the interdependency of the many individuals and groups is recognized and appropriate accountability is accepted by all.

ACCOUNTABILITY OF THE TEACHER EDUCATOR

Richard V. Jones
Dean, School of Education, Weber State College

To be accountable is to be responsible for a given task or duty. The problems seems to arise less from the definition of the term, however, but more from the source of the responsibility. Who decides, ultimately, on the arena of responsibility for each actor in the enterprise of public education? We in Teacher Education will specify our notion of our areas of responsibility, but they must be validated then by each of the entities represented at this conference.

We invite a dialog, because we believe that there is a unifying element or a common purpose among us all here today: effective schooling for the young people of Utah. In order to achieve that purpose, we must find ways to work together. We need to leave the divisions in the profession that were created in the past 20 years and find ways to join not only teacher educator and teacher, but also administrator and teacher, and state official and professor. Only with a sense of common purpose and community can we expect to accomplish our mission. Only with a sense of common purpose and community, can we expect to accomplish our mission.

Given that preamble, we in Teacher Education believe that we have five major areas for which we are--or should be--accountable. The areas are:

1. Theory Development.
2. Certification Skills.
3. Selection Process.
4. Academic Competence.
5. Research Orientation.

Let me clarify.

1. Teacher Education is accountable for providing the novice teacher with those fundamental theories, principles, and concepts upon which a life in the profession of teaching can be based.

   While there are those who would argue that Teacher Education needs to be more practical and less theoretical in orientation, we suggest that there is nothing more practical and useful than sound theory! The resistance to theory-based instruction seems related to a lack of understanding about the changing nature of the teaching profession, and, perhaps, a lack of faith in the ability of Teacher Education, and, particularly, practicing teachers to grow and change with additional information and research. In other words, we are helping people learn the craft of teaching when neither we nor they know where, when, how, or what they will be actually teaching! Perhaps we in Teacher Education don't actually teach anyone how to teach; better said, we teach about teaching and the individual learns to teach him/herself.

   At our best, we guide our students toward the development of a solid knowledge base; assist them in their acquisition of a repertoire of teaching skills; provide them with the opportunities to apply theory

and practice skills; and then support them with informed feedback when they stumble and praise them when they succeed in their first professional efforts.

If we are successful in our efforts, they leave us ready to learn the craft, or the profession, of teaching.

2. The second area of accountability, based upon the first one, is that we are responsible for the set of basic skills and competencies necessary to be certified as a teacher in Utah. In essence, it is our duty to assure the state that our graduates have command of a specified group of skills, or, at least, have demonstrated those skills to us.

   We are accountable for presenting the skills, for requiring our students to demonstrate them, and for finding places where our students can practice them. However, we are <u>not</u> responsible for these students once they become employed as teachers and move to their own classrooms with all of the unique pressures, characteristics, demands, and resources of that setting. We can forewarn but not predict; we can prepare our students with alternative solutions, but not dictate which solution to select. In other words, we hope that the skills and competencies we have seen our students demonstrate in a protected student teaching situation, combined with their own knowledge of sound theoretical constructs, will result in a teacher who is adaptable, investigative and able to adjust to the changing nature of the profession. Perhaps, when all is considered, these latter qualities, the ability to bring order from ambiguity by making new applications of sound principles, best describes an effective teacher.

3. The third area in which we must be accountable as teacher educators is the selection process, assuring that only the most promising of aspiring teachers are admitted to a preparation program. We are accountable for the process, yet we realize the imperfections in our methodology.

   We do not have the instruments and procedures to make fine distinctions but we are able to identify several qualities which seem related to effectiveness in any profession: the ability to learn, as demonstrated by success in a selected set of courses, for example; the help-oriented responsibility, as demonstrated by some type of helping experience; and the completion of necessary non-education general education.

   There is question, of course, concerning the degree to which Teacher Education institutions <u>should</u> be highly selective, because fine distinctions might suggest that there are only a limited set of characteristics which best represent a "teacher." Rather, we believe that each institution must be free to produce a wide variety of teacher types so that no particular bias can dominate in the teaching pool. Therefore, the selection processes used by our institutions attempt more to select those people who have the intellectual qualities which seem appropriate for a person entering the profession and a general positive orientation toward helping others. Rarely do we assess personality traits beyond this basic belief. Whether or not

a teacher is the "right kind of person" is the combined responsibility of all employing levels in our field--the colleges, the school districts, the boards, and local units--as well as, in our judgment, the profession itself. It is not up to the colleges to make the final decision; we are accountable for the initial applicants.

4. The fourth area for which those of us in Teacher Education must be accountable is the basic academic competence of our graduates. Our colleagues in higher education are accountable for the course work; but as the recommending body to the state, it is our responsibility to be sure the graduates have the linguistic, conceptual, historical, cultural, and scientific understanding which are characteristic of a learned person.

   Paul Brandwein, the noted science educator, suggested that the basic purpose of schooling is to produce a graduate who will "...interpose between impulse and action, evidence, reason, judgement, and compassion." While schools or colleges of education alone do not produce these qualities in their graduates, the teacher education units can provide assurance to the public that the new teachers have been exposed to, and successfully completed, the liberalizing education that Brandwein's statement tends to describe.

   Through the completion to baccalaureate requirements, we assure the state that the future teaching staff has demonstrated their ability to communicate effectively, and evaluate openly; that they have a degree of academic depth in a selected area; and that they have a breadth of study across the liberal arts.

5. The fifth basic area for which Teacher Education must be accountable is the quality of intellectual curiosity demonstrated by our graduates. The growth of the discipline of education is inextricably tied to the vigor of those who are pushing back the boundaries of present knowledge. Every principal and superintendent, every professor of education, and every classroom teacher and school counselor must be accountable for the effort to extend knowledge about teaching. Only in this way can we provide the support the teaching profession needs for continued recognition as a profession. Similarly, the teaching profession must be infused with the sense of inquiry, and the development of the inquiry skills needed to examine the teaching act is our responsibility. Our teachers must know, not only how to learn, but also how to live and work with ambiguity, how to delay judgments, and how to rely more on evidence than emotion. In sum, teachers must become increasingly inquiry oriented and research based if the profession is to grow.

   In our judgment (and with considerable written and informal evidence to support that judgment), we professors have not been as successful as we would like to be in this last area of accountability. Too many teachers do not trust research evidence, and teachers are not making experimentally-based judgments nearly as frequently as are those in other helping professions. We, in higher education, must accept our share of the fault. We have not yet found the way to encourage this experimental orientation in our students so that they can better

withstand the trials, pressures, stresses, and incessant demands of the classroom.

In order to clarify the areas in which we believe we are accountable, we thought it might be helpful to list a few areas for which we believe we are not accountable. These areas are listed in this paper only because some of our colleagues have suggested they become our responsibility on occasion.

A. We are not accountable for the phenomenon of "burnout" in the profession. When a bright, skillful, eager new teacher decides to withdraw, physically or psychologically, from his or her chosen profession after a few years, something is basically wrong with the system. The increase in the number of teachers who report such a reaction would suggest that either we need less sensitive teachers or more supportive teaching conditions. We hope the appropriate solution is obvious.

B. We are not accountable for the effectiveness of the teachers in the schools. For example, we do not prepare teachers for specific classrooms. As neither we, nor they, can know the characteristics of their future students, the general situation in which they will be teaching, nor the kind of resources which will be provided to them. They must rely on the basic skills they bring and augment them with local resources. We can only prepare someone with tools of the teacher trade; those of you in the local districts must provide the necessary physical and psychological support to carry them throughout a career.

C. Finally, we are not accountable for the substantial growth in the curriculum as a result of legislation, rules, or accreditation standards. The damage to instruction as teachers are asked to "add on" more and more to the lesson plan, and the amount of time available for the rest of the curriculum is reduced, has not been properly assessed. This instructional dilution, we contend, has received limited attention but is becoming more and more of a significant factor in the effectiveness of our schools.

Accountability is too often seen as a static issue; it is, of course, a very fluid and changing phenomena. It can change focus, it is multiple in application, and it can shift in importance. As the training arm of the profession, Teacher Education tried to coordinate research findings with the problems of daily practice. Our challenge is to assist the practitioner by translating basic research into useable information, suggested tactics, and alternative practices.

That very process begins to define the one last area of accountability which I mentioned at the beginning of this talk and would highlight how: coordination. In an enterprise as complex as public education, there are many people, positions, institutions, and associations that are "accountable." All could be said to be accountable for the ultimate produce--the education of a child. Similarly, one could be excused from that ultimate responsibility because the others are responsible.

Therefore, we in higher education believe that all of us have a kind of overriding responsibility to work together and to coordinate our efforts.

Areas of responsibility are a complex web of interactions and mutual responsibilities. Only when we share authority, power, and responsibility will we be productive on behalf of the children and youth of Utah. Only when we operate in concert, may we exercise our particular areas of accountability.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Gayle Judd
President, Utah Congress of Parents and Teachers, Inc.

Accountability has been a controversial process for the last ten years in education. Who's to be measured: the administration, the teachers, school boards, the students, or the parents? How is the measuring to be done: by evaluation, testing, observation, ratings, student accomplishment, or student screening? These are some of the questions that arise as we look at accountability that affects school process. So who has the right to hold whom accountable and how do we measure educational performance? It really depends to whom you are talking--whether you are talking to an administrator, teacher, or parent. Each has a different perception of educational accountability.

We would like to define accountability and the process that determines the worth, merit, or value of a performance, product, or a person in a particular role. Some administrators see accountability as bringing committees together to look at performance as a means to fill a board of education policy requirement. Administrators also view accountability as improving teacher effectiveness.

Professional accountability is viewed by many teachers as a means of putting pressure on public school teachers to improve the learning of the child, which isn't all bad. A teacher who is seriously interested in a child and his interests usually gains respect of the child and better performance. If a teacher expects respect from a child, he/she certainly has to earn it. Parents believe that teacher behavior certainly affect student achievement.

Parents feel that the area of accountability can be addressed in many ways. When parents think of the school, they usually view the administrators and teachers as one of the same. So, the following comments will be directed to both. Improving instruction in the classroom is the ultimate goal of accountability regardless of who is involved or who is measured.

Parents place a lot of value on personal characteristics of teachers. They tend to evaluate teachers by the way they dress, the language they use, the kind of conduct they display, and whether or not they show a friendly, caring attitude.

Parents also value competent, well-prepared teachers. Anyone performs better when well prepared.

Parents also realize that teacher quality and effort are not always responsible for student learning. The health of the child and the general overall intellectual environment of the home have a large influence on the child's learning.

Parents also know appropriate media materials, textbooks, and school supplies can have an affect on the learning process. Legislatures need to adequately fund education to provide a quality in our schools among learning tools and media equipment for all children.

Parents recognize that an effective use of time also affects student learning. "We do well that which we do often." Student learning is increased if more time is allocated to academic learning. Multiple research shows that the actual engaged time in which students are involved in academic materials makes a difference in student learning.

Rights and responsibilities also enter into the picture of professional accountability: administrator rights, teacher rights, school board rights, students rights, and parent rights.

Administrators have the right to see that our schools implement effective schooling practices. They have the right to equip our schools with well-qualified and capable teachers. They also have the right to give notice of dismissal under the orderly termination act. They also have the right to expel students from public school establishments if they do not conduct themselves within school policy.

Teachers have the right to expect students to learn, increase their competence, become better citizens, and prepare for a world of work. It is the teacher's responsibility to evaluate students. Of course the value of the teacher is demonstrated by the learning of his/her students. Teachers have the right to expect students to attend school on a regular school basis. If a child is not in school, he/she certainly cannot learn.

School boards have the right to set policy; they have the right to select materials and develop curriculum, working cooperatively with administration. School boards have the right to expect accountability from administrators and teachers. School boards have the right to determine how the money will be spent.

Students have the right to expect respect from teachers and administrators. They also have the right to expect teachers to be fair and friendly.

Parents have the right to expect a good return for their tax dollars. Parents have the right to press for more cost effective ways of administering school funds. Parents have the right to expect school boards to be accountable to them in all areas. They also have the right to demand that their children be tested in skills that schools teach because it is impossible to develop tests that cover all socio, economical, and ethnic groups. Parents have the right to expect higher standards for teachers for admission into educational programs at the college level to improve teacher competency.

We could sum up all parents reactions to accountability by saying, "when it comes to our children, we want the very best."

References

Peterson, K. & Kauchak, D.

Teacher Evaluation: Perspectives, Practices, and Promises.

Center for Educational Practices. Graduate School of Education/University of Utah, 1982.

Angelo, J., Making the Public Schools Work. Focus, 1982.

Olson, A. Cooperative Accountability Project, CAP Commentary, 1974, Vol. I, No. I.

Olson, A., Cooperative Accountability Project. Vol I, No. II.

Juneau, P., Governor's Task Force on Effective Schooling. Alaska Board of Education, Alaska Department of Education, 1981.

Dittmer, A., Assault With a Deadly Mandate: Minimum Competency Movement, 1978.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Norman H. Bangerter
Speaker, House of Representatives

[Outline]

I. Introduction

A. Children

During the next few years, Utah will experience unprecedented growth of this resource as the birth rate grows steadily and as more families move into the state.

B. To properly cultivate the potential of the state's growing numbers of children, we will need an ever increasing number of educational professionals to meet the children's educational needs.

1. Conservative estimates made by the State Board of Education indicate the enrollment increases would require at least 755 new classrooms each year over the next five years with an equivalent number of teachers plus requisite support personnel.

2. In 1980, Michael Murphy, in a study at the University of Utah, projected that by 1990 there would be approximately 500 more education administrative positions in the state than there were in 1978.

II. Professional Educators

We need in Utah a Class Act.

A. Establishing and maintaining a core of teachers, administrators, and supporting staff to meet the needs of Utah's children poses some serious challenges to the state's educational system; challenges in which the State Legislature is very interest.

We don't want to hold th opinion of George B. Shaw: "those who can - do; those who can't - teach."

B. Relevant issues with which the Legislature has recently dealt include the following:

1. What should teacher competency requirements in the state be?

a. <u>Farnsworth Resolution</u>

Representative Farnsworth sponsored a public education committee resolution (H.J.R. 6) in the last session which encourages school boards within the state to

establish a professional development plan for certified educators.

b. Local responsibility

While the state legislature is interested in encouraging the development of the state's educators, the administration of such development is largely a local responsibility. Local boards hire their teaching and administrative staffs and should therefore be ultimately responsible for the staff's performance.

2. How can Utah attract competent educational professionals to the state and keep them here?

While leaving the responsibility for professional development to local districts, the Legislature can help to attract the kind of professional people Utah is looking for by providing adequate financial resources and local flexibility to use those resources.

a. Salary

In the last session, the Legislature provided for a potential 13.92 percent salary increase for teachers by increasing the WPU value 9.97 percent and assuming all of the retirement costs for educators. In terms of retirement, this increase amounts to 3.95 percent of any given teacher's salary.

b. Other Ideas

Beyond salary increases, the Legislature is exploring other ideas which include the following:

(1) Differential Pay

H.G. 159 - School Finance - "No district may enter into contracts with teachers which would prevent districts from paying differential salaries or putting limitations on an individual salary paid in order to fill a shortage in specific teaching areas."

A provision such as this one can help school districts address staff shortages in areas of critical need like math and science.

(2) Teacher Mobility and Professional Cost Factor

The Public Education Interim Study Committee has been assigned "to study issues relating to teacher

mobility and professional cost factors used in developing school district budgets and maintaining experienced staff."

(3) Pay Productivity Plan

The Public Education Interim Study Committee has been assigned "to study the development of a plan to offer monetary incentives in the form of bonuses to employees of a given unit, agency, or school for increasing productivity without increasing costs or sacrificing quality."

3. How can we improve the productivity of the state's educational professionals.

In addition, to the pay productivity study from this year's study resolution, last year the legislature also appropriated $200,000 for two productivity studies in Weber and Washington districts. These studies are currently in operation under the direction of the Board of Education and report to a committee composed of two representatives and two senators.

III. Conclusion - The Need for Cooperation

In a recent address, Dr. Michael Usdan, director of the Institute for Educational Leadership, described educators as "pioneers who often circle their wagons and shoot inward."

If we are going to meet Utah's educational needs in the future, we cannot afford to follow this approach to our problems. Rather, we will need to work together to coordinate local responsibility with state resources. If we do so, we will be able to provide the educational needs of the state's most valuable natural resource, our children.

Facilitators

LaMar Allred
Wallace Allred
Hugh Baird
Dale Baker
Richard Blake
Caseel Burke
Keith Burnett
Bill Cowan
Eldon Drake
Amy Driscoll
Luan Ferrin
Ione Garcia
Frank Harmon
Art Jackson
Darrell Josie
Blair Low
Vere McHenry
Jeanette Misaka
Roger Mouritsen
Dave Nelson
Cordell Perkes
Don Smellie
Keith Steck
Dorothy Wardrop
Paul Warner
Clark Webb
Evelyn Wiggins
Ray Wilcox
Deanna Winn

SAMPLES OF QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PANEL MEMBERS

1. Under the present conditions facing teachers--low salaries, high turnover, high stress, and high teacher burnout--how can we attract aspiring students as candidates in the profession?

2. How can the colleges of education interface more effectively with other segments of the college?

3. Is there a way in which we might increase the field experiences in a more meaningful way?

4. If the teaching profession were put on a level of other professions with higher salaries, fewer students, and more parent cooperation, would we have more equality in teaching?

5. How can we best let the university people know the needs of those who train the students teachers in the field and vice versa?

ACCEPTANCE OF AWARD

Oral L. Ballam
Dean, College of Education, Utah State University

I regret very, very much that I cannot be with you today to personally express my appreciation for the honor you have extended to me. I am well aware that many of you deserve this award as much or more than I. It was, therefore, a humbling moment of surprise when I learned I had been selected by you, my respected friends and peers, for this recognition.

As you know I am dedicated, as are all of us, to excellence in education at all levels. I suppose I respect and admire most those teachers and leaders at the local level who, in the district, in the individual schools, and in the individual classrooms, really determine the level of excellence in instruction and learning for the students and citizens of Utah.

I and those of us at Utah State University and in other higher education institutions are grateful for the opportunity to contribute, in our way, to the excellence of educational endeavor found in the schools of Utah. Thank you for allowing me to represent all of you and your dedication to excellence in education. I am proud to accept this award as a symbol of excellence for all of us and am grateful to be counted as your friend and fellow professional.

On a personal note, I have had a long standing date with my doctor for some corrective surgery. I pay him rather handsomely for his advice and services. I considered changing the date of surgery in order to be here today; he wouldn't. So . . . I am not here, obviously. His strict instructions were, "No lots of things," including no riding in a car to Provo. Therefore, considering what I pay for his advice, I took it.

So again, my sincere thanks and my sincere apology for not being with you. I woud have enjoyed it very, very much, as you all know.

As for my good friend Art Jackson, who has agreed to stand in for me on this auspicious occasion, I repeat my instructions to him. I asked him to ad lib my response. He agreed and said he would do so and tell you all he knew and thought about me. I, therefore, quickly reconsidered and wrote my response. He knows too much about me.

Now, my instructions to Art is to accept the award before he tells you all he knows and thinks about me. Otherwise, you will reconsider and give the recognition to someone more deserving than I.

Again, thank you very, very much--and most sincere best wishes to all of you.

UTAH TEACHER EDUCATOR OF THE YEAR

Recipients

1974	Dorothy Zimmerman	Utah Education Association
1975	Caseel D. Burke	Weber State College
1976	L. Ray Brown	Jordan School District
1977	Eldon Drake	Utah State University
1978	Allan Davis/Sheryl Lewis	Alpine School District
1979	Carma M. Hales	USAIL Project
1980	Roger C. Mouritsen	Utah State Office of Education
1981	Vere A. McHenry	Utah State Office of Education
1982	Oral L. Ballam	Utah State University

ANNUAL SPRING CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

Alpine

Patti Greaves
Roy Pehrson
Duane Schock
Evelyn Barton
Kelly Harper
Quinn Hatch

Beaver

Richard Webster
Johann Meyer
Richard Limb

Box Elder

Steven Johnson

Carbon

Jack Kobe

Davis

Lawrence B. Welling

Grand

Barbara Ing
Doris Wilson

Granite

Dorothy McDonald
Ruth Wenberg
Georgia Veater
Joyce Baskin
Joseph Hansen
Ralf Riches
Lois Anderson
Thurlow Bailey
Almina Barksdale
Darrel Allington
Don Hess
Luciano Martinez
Ellis Worthen
Mildred Martin

Iron

O. Kent Hulet

Jordan

Spencer Young
LaMar Drew
Roger Phillips
Grant Pullan
George Welch
Eric D. Johnson
L. Ray Brown
Richard Gourley
Val Farnsworth

Logan

George Duersch Stuart Smith
Clyde Bartlett
Kathy Brunson

Murray

Nellie Higbee
Beck Sheffield

Nebo

J. Rulon Nelson
Kelly Clements
Stanley Burningham
Paul H. Beckstrom
Allen Gurney

Ogden

Phyllis Shaw
Shirley Bergeson
Norma Salmond
Charlean Sattiewhite
Phyllis Savage
Ralph Russo
Norman Skanchy
Larry Carrillo
Gerald H. Raat

Provo

Eve Mitchell
Lori White
Cathy Coleman
Larry Henry
Lincoln Card
Grady Edenfield
Jim Spencer
Scott Ward

Salt Lake City

Stanley R. Morgan
Pat M. Nielson
Pat Arakaki
Sharon Pittam
Ronald W. Lamb
Fay Grover
Ted Skolmoskie

Washington

Jack F. Burr

Weber State College

Keith R. Burnett
Richard H. Blake
Caseel Burke
Jim Merrill
Blair Lowe
Karen Nielsen
Evan Memmott
Roger Mouritsen

Utah State University

Deanne Winn
Arthur Jackson
Evelyn Wiggins
Don Smellie
Eldon M. Drake
William Strong

Southern Utah State College

Kent Myer
Charlene Swanson
R. Michael Smith
Burton R. Price

Westminster College

Martha Monroe
Pat Whitfield
Fredna Scroggins
Barbara Galler
Ron Cohn

Brigham Young University

Curtis N. Van Alfen
Ralph B. Smith
James E. Baird
Max Berryessa
Frank Harmon
Eldon Puckett
Darwin F. Gale
Paul Warner
James Harris
Cregg Ingram
Richard Heaps
Robert Ward
Norma Rohde
Ivan Muse
C. Garn Coombs
David Squires
Wallace E. Allred
Larry M. Arnoldsen
Ray T. Wilcox
Clark Webb
Hugh Baird
Clifford Edwards
Gardner Snow

University of Utah

Ruth Lundgren
William Nutting
Amy Driscoll
Odean Hess
Ione Garcia
Ken Peterson
Gerolyn Greer
Sharon Griener
Marilyn Remington
Donna Smith
Mary Olson
Barbara Call
Janet Smith
Lida Storrs
Alida McDowell
Ted Stephens
Carol Larson
Afton Meldrum
Ona Patterson
Jayne Holman
Briant Farnsworth
Junnie Shiatani

University of Utah (Cont.)

Shawna Bliss
Jeanette Bredthauer
Bertha Parega
Margery Scott
Norma Swenson
Jean Van Dyke
Carol Ann Kussie

Utah Education Association

Daryl J. McCarty
H. Lowell Baum

Utah State Office of Education

Keith Steck
Phil Hardy
Bill Cowan
LeRoy Lindeman
Avery Glenn
Dave Nelson
Ken Lindsey
Dorothy Wardrop
Darrell Josie
Richard Peterson

Uni Serve Directsors

Robert Bell